

REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action mailed on March 29, 2007.

Claims 1, 6, 11, 20, 43, 46, and 49 are amended, claims 5, 18-19, 24-42, and 48 are canceled, and claims 50-51 are added; as a result, claims 1-4, 6-17, 20-23, 43-47, and 49-51 are now pending in this application.

35 USC § 102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-21 and 46-49 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by *De Vries* (U.S. Patent 6,968,179).

The Examiner has indicated that claim 5 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of its base claim and any intervening claims. Independent claim 1 has been amended herein to include all of the limitations of previous claim 5. Therefore, claim 1 should now be in form for allowance and allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

The Examiner has indicated that claim 19 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of its base claim and any intervening claims. Independent claim 11 has been amended herein to include all of the limitations of previous claims 18 and 19. Therefore, claim 11 should now be in form for allowance and allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

The Examiner has indicated that claim 48 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of its base claim and any intervening claims. Independent claim 46 has been amended herein to include all of the limitations of previous claim 48. Therefore, claim 46 should now be in form for allowance and allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-10, claims 12-21, and claims 47-49 are dependent claims that depend either directly or indirectly from independent claims 1, 11, and 46, respectively. Consequently, these claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as their corresponding base claims. These claims also provide further bases for patentability. For example, the Examiner has indicated that claims 6, 14, 20-21, and 49 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of their base claims and any intervening claims.

Claims 33-42 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Darrell et al.* (U.S. Publication 2005/0162523).

The Applicants do not agree with the above rejection. However, claims 33-42 have been canceled herein, without prejudice or disclaimer, in order to expedite prosecution of the other claims. Applicants reserve the right to reintroduce these claims in a future patent application.

35 USC § 103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 22-32 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *De Vries* (U.S. Patent 6,968,179) in view of *Darrell et al.* (U.S. Publication 2005/0162523).

The Applicants do not agree with the above rejection. However, claims 24-32 have been canceled herein, without prejudice or disclaimer, in order to expedite prosecution of the other claims. Applicants reserve the right to reintroduce these claims in a future patent application.

Claims 22 and 23 are dependent claims that depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 11. Consequently, these claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 11 discussed above. For the reasons identified in the response mailed on December 1, 2006, these claims also provide further bases for patentability.

Claims 43-45 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *De Vries* (U.S. Patent 6,968,179) in view of *Amano et al.* (U.S. Publication 2002/0142737).

Claim 43 has been amended herein in the same manner as claim 1. As a result, claim 43 has all of the same limitations as claim 1, plus an additional element. Therefore, claim 43 is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1 described above.

Claims 44-45 are dependent claims that depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 43. Consequently, these claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 43.

New Claims

New claims 50 and 51 have been added. These claims are both dependent claims that depend from claim 46. Consequently, these claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 46 described above. In addition, these claims each provide further basis for patentability. For example, claim 50 includes subject matter that is substantially similar to that of claim 14.

Similarly, claim 51 includes subject matter that is substantially similar to that of claim 21. As described below, the Examiner has indicated that claims 14 and 21 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of their base claims and any intervening claims.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 5, 6, 14, 19, 20, 21, 48 and 49 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

As described above, claims 5, 19, and 48 have been incorporated into their respective base claims.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney (480-948-3745) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

TONIA G. MORRIS ET AL.

By their Representatives,

Customer Number: 45643
480-948-3745

Date 5/29/07

By John C. Scott
John C. Scott
Reg. No. 38,613

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 29 day of May, 2007.

Jenny Kathman
Jenny Kathman